UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,989	06/30/2003	Xiao M. Gao	ITL.0933US (P15730)	1067
21906 TROP PRUNEI	7590 12/03/200 R & HU. PC	8	EXAMINER	
1616 S. VOSS I	ROAD, SUITE 750		JAMAL, ALEXANDER	
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/609,989	GAO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ALEXANDER JAMAL	2614			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a refricted will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT atute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ 1 Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice under	This action is non-final. wance except for formal matte	-			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withe 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers	drawn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a 	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application _·			

Application/Control Number: 10/609,989 Page 2

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Response to submitted remarks

- 1. The examiner notes that no claims have been amended, only arguments submitted.
- 2. Examiner notes patent to Harnett (USRE39051E) that discloses using a fuzzy inference system to match impedances.
- 3. The examiner notes the interview summary filed 5-8-2008 which describes examiner's proposed amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-5,9-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al. (US2004/0101130A1), and further in view of Altekar at al. (US 20040022308 A1), and further in view of Jeffery et al. (6970905).

As per **claim 1**, Shi discloses a system comprising a signal generator (inherently comprised in Xmit path 62 in Fig. 9D to provide the transmitted stimulus disclosed in page 11 paragraph 121), impedance mismatch hardware (switches 82a,82b,86a,86b) coupled to impedances R4,R3 in Fig. 9D), and a controller (DSP disclosed in page 12 paragraph 130) is used to measure subscriber loop characteristics to determine DSL capability (page 1 paragraph 3). Shi's system functions to maximize the received signal (para. 28), and uses the delay between the transmitted and received signals to determine the loop length (para.

26,27,38). Shi discloses the known problem of test signal attenuation and discloses modifying the impedance of the hybrid in order to reduce the attenuation of the echo signals perform loop calibration. However, Shi does not disclose that the DSP implements a fuzzy inference system to adjust an impedance value in order to maximize the echo signal when performing a loop qualification.

Altekar teaches an adaptable hybrid and teaches that the impedance of the hybrid may be varied in order to increase or decrease the echo for a desired application (para. 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement an adaptable impedance in order to increase the echo to an optimized value (maximal value) for the purpose of overcoming the disclosed problem of test signal echo attenuation during loop qualification.

Jeffery discloses a DSL system that monitors and analyzes measured conditions on the DSL line, including cable impedance and signal to noise ratio. Jeffery teaches that specialized logic, such as Fuzzy Logic may be used by the system in order to select the optimum configuration for the DSL modem (Col 15 lines 1-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement fuzzy logic in the controller of Shi and Altekar for the purpose of providing the optimum configuration and results for the DSL tests. The DSP of Shi and Altekar, when operating with fuzzy logic will be a fuzzy inference system.

As per **claim 10**, claim rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. FDR and TDR methods use the echo delay is used to determine the loop characteristics (page 11 paragraphs 119,121).

As per **claim 14**, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10. The DSP (page 11 paragraph 119) inherently comprises software for the purpose of controlling the hardware. The DSP controller of Shi in view of Jeffery's teachings, is a fuzzy inference system that adjusts the impedance seen by reflected signals by activating or deactivating (via switches) the hybrid or termination circuitry. This will function to modify the received signals because the impedance will be different.

As per claim 2, the impedance comprises a resistance (R3,R4).

As per **claim 3**, the system comprises an active termination impedance (page 11 paragraph 120).

As per **claim 4**, the receive signal the echo measured in either the FDR, or TDR method) is modified when the active termination impedance and hybrid are activated or deactivated (page 11 paragraphs120-124).

As per **claims 5,9,** the FDR and TDR tests measure the loop length and impedance which determine the ability to run a DSL on the loop (page 11 paragraph 119).

As per **claims 7**, the DSP controller is a fuzzy inference system that adjusts the impedance seen by reflected signals by activating or deactivating (via switches) the

hybrid or termination circuitry. This will function to modify the received signals because the impedance will be different.

As per **claim 8,** FDR and TDR methods use the echo delay is used to determine the loop characteristics (page 11 paragraphs 119,121). The amplitudes and time delay of the reflected signals is measured (page 11 paragraph 121).

As per claims 11,15, claim rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-8.

As per **claim 12**, claim rejected for the same reasons as claim 5. Additionally loop taps may be determined via measurements of standing waves. The resonant frequencies will indicate loop taps (impedance mismatches), and the loop length, which itself is a determination of the loop impedance, which is an indication of the insertion loss.

As per **claim 13**, the loop characterisitics are used to measure subscriber loop characteristics to determine DSL capability (page 1 paragraph 3).

As per claims 16-18, claim rejected for the same reasons as claims 8,12,13.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's argument that Shi teaches away from using the time difference approach, the examiner maintains that Shi discloses known systems using the well known time difference approach, And further that Shi discloses a well known problem with said systems (test echo attenuation). A problem that is remedied by Altekar.

As per applicant's argument's that Altekar does not teach that the hybrid may be adjusted to increase or decrease the echo for a specific application, the examiner again notes Altekar paragraph 27 where those elements are specifically stated.

As per applicant's arguments that there is no teaching to maximize echoes by adjusting impedance, the examiner contends it would be obvious to solve the disclosed, well-known problem of test echo attenuation by maximizing the echo amplitude with the known variable hybrid of Altekar. Altekar specifically discloses the variable hybrid may be designed to be variable in order to specifically decrease or **increase** the echo for a given application (such as the known time-difference application disclosed by Shi).

As per applicant's arguments that the claims as written do track Figure 3, the examiner disagrees. The claims do not track Figure 3 as they do not specify the algorithmic logic and processing step of block 350 of applicant's Fig. 3.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Application/Control Number: 10/609,989

Art Unit: 2614

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

Page 7

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner

can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications

and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

/Alexander Jamal/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Examiner Alexander Jamal

December 3, 2008